UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,862	09/11/2003	Wael R. Joseph	KCC 4979.2 (K-C 19,378C)	5051

321 7590 02/27/2007

SENNIGER POWERS
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
16TH FLOOR
ST LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER	
AHMED, HASAN SYED	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1615	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/27/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 02/27/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/659,862	JOSEPH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hasan S. Ahmed	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 December 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-59* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *31-59* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See Continuation Sheet*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :10/20/06 and 11/02/06

DETAILED ACTION

- Receipt is acknowledged of applicants': (1) amendments/remarks, which were filed on 4 December 2006; (2) IDS, which was filed on 2 November 2006; and (3) IDS, which was filed on 20 October 2006.
- The amendments filed on 2 November 2006 have been entered.
- The claim objection of the previous Office action is withdrawn in light of the amendment.
- The 35 USC 103 rejection of the previous Office action is withdrawn in light of the remarks.
- The 35 USC 112(1) and provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections of the previous Office action are maintained.
- Currently pending claims 1-30 remain rejected under 35 USC 112(1) and 103, and provisional obviousness-type double patenting.

* * * * *

MAINTAINED REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled

in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the specification does not teach how to use glucosylceramide, *i.e.*, no amounts, weights, or percentages are given; no mention is made as to how the glucosylceramide is effectively incorporated into the tissue product claimed.

* * * * *

NEW REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-14 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klofta, *et. al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,682).

Klofta, *et. al.* teach a tissue product (*see* claim 1). The tissue product is comprised of:

- the emollient (fatty acid) of instant claim 1 (*see* abstract);
- the humectant (polyols) of instant claim 1 (*see* col. 25, line 16);
- the immobilizing agent (fatty alcohols) of instant claim 1 (*see* col. 24, lines 4-14);
- the compatibilizing (propylene glycol) agent of instant claim 1 (*see* col. 17, line 28);
- the fatty acids of instant claim 2 (*see* abstract);
- the dimethicone of instant claim 3 (*see* col. 20, line 18);

- the glycerin of instant claims 5-7 (*see* col. 17, line 21);
- the polyethylene glycol of instant claims 9 and 10 (*see* col. 17, lines 20-42);
- the stearyl alcohol, of instant claim 11 (*see* col. 24, line 11);
- the propylene glycol of instant claim 12 (*see* col. 17, line 22);
- the dispersing agent of instant claim 13 (*see* col. 22, line 24);
- the polydimethylsiloxanes of instant claim 14 (*see* col. 22, line 24); and
- the surfactant of instant claim 25 (*see* col. 5, line 17).

Klofta, *et. al.* explain that combining the disclosed ingredients into one tissue product is beneficial because they impart, "...a soft and lubricious feel..." *See* col. 4, line 41.

Klofta, *et. al.* teach: (1) about 5% to about 50% emollient (*see* col. 19, lines 25 and 26); (2) about 5% to about 60% humectant (*see* col. 17, line 42); (3) about 5% to about 60% immobilizing agent (*see* col. 27, line 15); and (4) about 5% to about 50% compatibilizing agent (*see* col. 19, lines 25 and 26).

Although Klofta, *et. al.* do not explicitly teach all the percentages recited in instant claims 1, 4, and 8, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine suitable percentages through routine or manipulative experimentation to obtain the best possible results, as these are variable parameters attainable within the art.

Moreover, generally, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the

prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456; 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Applicants have not demonstrated any unexpected or unusual results, which accrue from the instant percentage ranges.

The Klofta, *et. al.* reference is silent with respect to the (1) phase temperatures of instant claims 1 and 28-30; (2) melting point of instant claim 26; (3) and penetration hardness of instant claim 27. Applicants teach concentration ranges of emollient, humectant, immobilizing agent, and compatibilizing agent that overlap with the prior art. Properties are the same when the structure and composition are the same. Thus, burden shifts to applicant to show unexpected results, by declaration or otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 594. In the alternative, the claimed properties would have been present once the composition was employed in its intended use. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 433.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine an emollient , a humectant, an immobilizing agent, and a compatibilizing agent into a tissue product, as taught by Klofta, *et. al.* One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine these ingredients into a tissue product for the beneficial effect of a soft and lubricious feel, as explained by Klofta, *et. al.*

*

2. Claims 1, and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klofta, *et. al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,682) in view of Krzysik, *et. al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,440,437).

Klofta, *et. al.* teach a tissue product (*see* above).

The Klofta, *et. al.* reference differs from the instant application in that it does not teach the skin barrier of instant claims 15-17, the antioxidant of instant claims 18-20, and the sterol of instant claims 21 and 22.

Krzysik, *et. al.* teach a wipe (*see* abstract) comprising:

- the about 0.1% to about 30% skin barrier enhancing agent of instant claim 15 (*see* col. 4, line 9);
- the oil of instant claim 16 (*see* col. 4, line 2);
- the avocado oil of instant claim 17 (*see* col. 4, line 2);
- 0.3% antioxidant (within the range of instant claim 18; *see* col. 17, Formulas 1-7);
- the tocopherol of instant claims 19 and 20 (*see* col. 17, Formulas 1-7);
- the about 0.1% to about 10% sterol of instant claim 21 (*see* col. 7, line 56); and
- the cholesterol of instant claim 22 (*see* col. 4, line 4).

Krzysik, *et. al.* explain that combining the disclosed ingredients into one wipe is beneficial because they, "...help maintain skin barrier function..." *See* col. 2, lines 64-65.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine an emollient, a humectant, an immobilizing agent, a compatibilizing agent, a skin barrier enhancing agent, an antioxidant, and a sterol into a

tissue product, as taught by Klofta, *et. al.* in view of Krzysik, *et. al.* One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine these ingredients into a tissue product for the beneficial effect of a soft and lubricious feel, as explained by Klofta, *et. al.* and to help maintain skin barrier function, as explained by Krzysik, *et. al.*

*

3. Claims 1, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klofta, *et. al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,682) in view of Bowser, *et. al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,342,976).

Klofta, *et. al.* teach a tissue product (*see* above).

The Klofta, *et. al.* reference differs from the instant application in that it does not teach the ceramide and glucosylceramide of instant claims 23 and 24.

Bowser, *et. al.* teach a skin composition that may be used in a tissue product, such as a tissue wipe (*see* col. 16, line 44).

The disclosed composition contains the ceramide and glucosylceramide of instant claims 23 and 24 (*see* col. 1, line 67).

Bowser, *et. al.* explain that a ceramide, such as glucosylceramide, is beneficial in a skin composition because, "...when applied topically to the skin, bring(s) about a marked improvement in skin condition, by enhancing skin barrier function." *See* col. 2, lines 7-9.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a ceramide, such as glucosylceramide to a tissue product,

as taught by Klofta, *et. al.* in view of Bowser, *et. al.* One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to this ingredient into a tissue product for the beneficial effect of enhancing skin barrier function, as explained by Bowser, *et. al.*

* * * * *

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-61 of copending Application No. 10/659,969 ('969). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '969 claims an absorbent product comprising a moisturizing and lubricating composition comprising an

emollient, a humectant, an immobilizing agent, and a compatibilizing agent. *See* claim 1.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

* * * * *

Response to Arguments

MAINTAINED REJECTION - 35 USC 112(1)

Applicants argue that written description support for glucosylceramide is found in original claim 24. *See* remarks, page 21.

The word "glucosylceramide" is mentioned only in instant claims 24 and 56; it does not appear anywhere else in the original disclosure. A person of ordinary skill in the art is not given any guidance in the disclosure as to how the glucosylceramide is incorporated into the claimed tissue product. No amounts, weights, or percentages are provided; no examples are provided; no mention is made as to how the applicants intend this compound to be incorporated into a tissue product, as they instantly claim. As such, examiner respectfully submits that instant claim 24 is not supported by an adequate written description in the instant disclosure.

*

WITHDRAWN REJECTION – 35 USC 103(a)

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection stated above.

☆

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hasan S. Ahmed whose telephone number is 571-272-4792. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

***

HUMERA N. SHEIKH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TC-1600